

The Difference Pendulum: A Lyapunov Meter for Chaotic Double Pendula

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

November 17, 2025

The double pendulum is a familiar icon of classical chaos: two rigid rods, four phase-space variables, and trajectories that diverge explosively from nearly identical initial conditions. Standard treatments of this sensitivity rely on abstract quantities such as Lyapunov exponents or on side-by-side plots of two trajectories. In this thought-experiment paper, we propose a more concrete and visual device: the *difference pendulum*, a third virtual pendulum whose motion is driven solely by the difference between two chaotic double pendula. In our construction, two identical double pendulum simulators, A and B, evolve from slightly perturbed initial conditions. At each time step we compute a scalar difference signal, such as the horizontal separation between the lower masses of A and B. This signal acts as a forcing term on a third, driven pendulum D. When A and B track each other closely, D remains nearly quiescent. As their trajectories peel apart in phase space, D is shaken into increasingly large and irregular motion. In this way, the amplitude of D serves as a virtual Lyapunov meter that turns abstract divergence into an animated, pendulum-like observable. We outline the equations, numerical protocol, and visualization design, and discuss how this device clarifies sensitive dependence and predictability horizons in chaotic systems.

Keywords: double pendulum, chaos, Lyapunov exponent, numerical experiment, difference pendulum, sensitivity to initial conditions, divergence, visualization, phase space, thought experiment.

A collaboration with GPT-5.1-Thinking-Extended. 39 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The double pendulum as a canonical chaotic system
- 1.2 Standard measures of sensitivity: error growth and Lyapunov exponents
- 1.3 Motivation for an embodied “difference meter”
- 1.4 Overview of the difference pendulum concept and structure of the paper

2. Classical Double Pendulum Dynamics

- 2.1 Geometry, coordinates, and parameters of a single double pendulum
- 2.2 Equations of motion and energy conservation
- 2.3 Typical chaotic regimes and qualitative behavior
- 2.4 Numerical integration choices and accuracy considerations

3. Twin Double Pendula and Difference Signals

- 3.1 Defining pendula A and B with nearly identical initial conditions
- 3.2 Phase-space distance measures between trajectories
- 3.3 Practical scalar difference signals: angle differences, Cartesian separations
- 3.4 Expected exponential growth of small differences in chaotic regimes

4. The Difference Pendulum Model

- 4.1 Introducing a third virtual pendulum D with angle $\phi(t)$
- 4.2 Driven, damped pendulum equation with forcing from A–B difference
- 4.3 Choice of parameters: natural frequency, damping, and coupling strength
- 4.4 Interpreting D’s energy and amplitude as a Lyapunov meter
- 4.5 Variants: linear vs nonlinear restoring forces, alternative drivings

5. Numerical Experiment Protocol

- 5.1 Initialization: small perturbations between A and B
- 5.2 Time stepping: simultaneous integration of A, B, and D
- 5.3 Measuring divergence: D amplitude thresholds and saturation
- 5.4 Estimating effective Lyapunov rates from D’s early-time growth
- 5.5 Robustness to noise, discretization, and parameter changes

6. Visualization and mp4 Design

- 6.1 Layout with three panels: A, B, and D
- 6.2 Color and camera choices for intuitive comparison
- 6.3 Time overlays and annotations for divergence events
- 6.4 Additional plots: D amplitude vs time and log-scale growth
- 6.5 Using the animation as a teaching tool for sensitive dependence

7. Extensions and Variants

- 7.1 Multiple difference modes: separate D_x and D_y pendula
- 7.2 Feedback variants where D perturbs A and B
- 7.3 Alternative chaotic bases: driven pendula, triple pendula, coupled rotors
- 7.4 Stochastic perturbations and hybrid quantum-classical interpretations

8. Conceptual and Pedagogical Discussion

- 8.1 Making Lyapunov growth tangible and intuitive
- 8.2 Predictability horizons and “when D wakes up”
- 8.3 Embodied metaphors for diverging “nearby realities”
- 8.4 Limitations of the construction and what it does not capture

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 Summary of the difference pendulum idea
- 9.2 Summary of numerical and visualization benefits
- 9.3 Possible implementations in teaching, outreach, and further research
- 9.4 Future directions: from thought experiment to interactive simulation

10. References

1. Introduction

The double pendulum occupies a special place in the study of classical mechanics. On the surface it is a simple device: two rigid rods connected by pivots, swinging in a gravitational field. Yet its equations of motion produce trajectories that are notoriously sensitive to initial conditions. A millimeter difference in starting position or a barely perceptible variation in release angle can lead, within a few swings, to radically different motions. This combination of simplicity in construction and complexity in behavior has made the double pendulum a standard exhibit in textbooks, laboratories, and popular science demonstrations.

In most discussions, however, the chaotic character of the double pendulum remains an abstract property. We may see two traces separating on a screen, or read that the largest Lyapunov exponent is positive, but the experience of “how fast nearby realities peel apart” is still confined to mathematical graphs and verbal descriptions. The notion that two systems, identical in all parameters but infinitesimally different in initial conditions, quickly stop “knowing about each other” is powerful, yet remains intangible for many learners.

This paper proposes a concrete, visual device to bridge that gap: the difference pendulum. Rather than only tracking the distance between two trajectories numerically, we introduce a third virtual pendulum whose motion is driven by the evolving difference between two chaotic double pendula. When the two base pendula are nearly synchronized, the difference pendulum is quiet. As their trajectories diverge in phase space, it is shaken into progressively larger and more irregular motion. In this way, the amplitude and energy of the difference pendulum serve as an embodied Lyapunov meter, turning an abstract exponential growth rate into something that “looks and feels” like a third pendulum being dragged into chaos.

The remainder of this introduction sets the stage. We briefly review the status of the double pendulum as a canonical chaotic system, summarize standard measures of sensitivity to initial conditions, explain why those measures can remain abstract even for technically trained readers, and then outline the structure of the difference pendulum construction developed in this paper.

1.1 The double pendulum as a canonical chaotic system

A single simple pendulum has one angular coordinate and one angular velocity; its dynamics are completely characterized by a two-dimensional phase space. For small amplitudes the motion is nearly harmonic; even for larger swings the motion remains regular and predictable. By contrast, the double pendulum introduces four phase-space variables: two angles and two angular velocities. With this increased dimensionality come nonlinear coupling terms in the equations of motion that allow for genuine chaotic behavior.

Experimentally and numerically, one observes a striking qualitative regime. For some energy ranges and parameter choices, the upper arm swings in a relatively regular way while the lower arm occasionally whips over the top, performs complex loops, or abruptly changes direction. A video of a double pendulum released from apparently similar starting configurations can show two trajectories that seem synchronized for a few oscillations and then diverge completely: one configuration continues in moderate swings while the other begins to tumble, or the timing of the flips changes in a way that rapidly becomes uncorrelated.

This behavior is the hallmark of chaos in deterministic systems: trajectories starting in a small neighborhood of phase space separate exponentially fast along at least one direction. The double pendulum is widely used to illustrate this property because it is both mechanically accessible and mathematically tractable. Its status as a “canonical chaotic system” reflects this combination of physical simplicity and dynamical richness. In teaching and outreach, the double pendulum often serves as the first encounter many students have with deterministic chaos.

1.2 Standard measures of sensitivity: error growth and Lyapunov exponents

The usual way to formalize sensitive dependence is to consider two trajectories, $x(t)$ and $x'(t)$, that start from nearly identical initial conditions. One defines an initial separation $\delta x(0)$ and then studies the evolution of $\delta x(t) = x'(t) - x(t)$ as time progresses. In a chaotic regime, the norm of this difference typically grows as

$$\|\delta x(t)\| \approx \|\delta x(0)\| e^{\lambda t}$$

for some positive Lyapunov exponent λ , at least until nonlinear saturation effects intervene. The exponent λ characterizes how quickly small uncertainties in initial conditions unfold into macroscopic discrepancies in predicted states.

In numerical practice, one simulates two copies of the system with slightly perturbed initial data and periodically renormalizes the difference vector to maintain numerical stability. The rate at which the renormalization factor grows yields an estimate of the largest Lyapunov exponent. Alternatively, if one is interested in finite-time predictability, one can ask: given a tolerable final uncertainty scale, how long does it take for an initial uncertainty of a given size to grow beyond that tolerance?

These tools are powerful but abstract. They live primarily in plots of $\log \|\delta x(t)\|$ versus t , or in quoted numerical values for λ . For many audiences, even those comfortable with differential equations, such measures remain disconnected from the visceral experience of watching a mechanical system move. It can be difficult to “see” what a Lyapunov exponent of a particular numerical value really means, or to translate an error growth curve into an intuitive sense of when two nearly identical systems can be treated as effectively independent.

1.3 Motivation for an embodied “difference meter”

The central motivation of this work is to close the gap between the formal definition of sensitive dependence and a direct, animated representation of it. When instructors show two double pendula side by side, the qualitative message is clear: “Look, they drift apart quickly.” But the divergence is still encoded in the relative motion of two similar, complex objects. The eye can struggle to quantify how “different” they really are at a given moment, especially once the motions become intricate in their own right.

By introducing a third object whose sole job is to respond to the difference between the other two, we create an explicit “difference meter.” Instead of inspecting two separate trajectories and mentally subtracting them, the observer can watch the response of a single driven pendulum whose amplitude grows as the underlying divergence grows. The difference pendulum becomes a mechanical analog of the abstract difference vector in phase space.

This idea is conceptually simple: two chaotic subsystems generate a time-dependent difference signal, which in turn acts as a forcing term on a third driven oscillator. Yet, as far as we are aware, this specific configuration has not been developed in the context of double pendulum pedagogy. It has several appealing features. It makes the growth of small differences tangible; it suggests a time scale over which predictability is lost (“the time when the difference pendulum wakes up”); and it offers a visual metaphor for the divergence of nearby “worlds” in any chaotic setting.

1.4 Overview of the difference pendulum concept and structure of the paper

The construction studied in this paper proceeds in three layers. First, we define two identical double pendulum simulators, labeled A and B, with the same physical parameters but slightly different initial conditions. Their equations of motion are those of the standard planar double pendulum in a gravitational field. Integrated in parallel, these two systems provide the base chaotic dynamics and the raw material for difference signals.

Second, at each integration step we compute a scalar quantity that reflects the instantaneous mismatch between A and B. This could be as simple as the horizontal separation between their lower masses, a weighted combination of angular differences, or a more general function of their phase-space coordinates. The choice of difference signal shapes the way in which divergence is presented, but the essential requirement is that it vanish when A and B are exactly synchronized and grow as their states diverge.

Third, we introduce the difference pendulum D, a driven, damped oscillator whose equation of motion includes the difference signal as an external forcing term. When the difference signal is negligible, D behaves like a near-stationary simple pendulum. As the signal grows and acquires irregular structure, D is excited into larger oscillations and eventually into complex, quasi-

chaotic motion of its own. Its amplitude and energy thus serve as a proxy for the underlying divergence between A and B.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the equations and qualitative behavior of a single double pendulum. Section 3 introduces the twin pendula A and B and discusses practical choices of difference signals. Section 4 defines the difference pendulum model and examines how its parameters affect its responsiveness to divergence. Section 5 outlines a numerical experiment protocol for integrating the coupled system and estimating effective Lyapunov rates from the early-time growth of the difference pendulum's amplitude. Section 6 describes an animation and visualization design that places A, B, and D side by side for pedagogical use. Section 7 explores extensions and variants, including feedback configurations and alternative chaotic bases. Section 8 discusses conceptual implications and teaching applications, and Section 9 concludes with a summary and suggestions for future work.

2. Classical Double Pendulum Dynamics

The difference pendulum construction rests on a clear understanding of the ordinary, unmodified double pendulum. In this section we briefly review its geometry and coordinates, write down its equations of motion in a form suitable for numerical integration, and summarize the typical chaotic behavior that motivates using it as the base system. We close with practical remarks on numerical schemes and accuracy, since the difference pendulum is ultimately driven by quantities computed from two simultaneous simulations.

2.1 Geometry, coordinates, and parameters of a single double pendulum

A standard planar double pendulum consists of two rigid rods and two point masses, constrained to move in a vertical plane under gravity. The first rod is attached to a fixed pivot; the second rod is attached to the end of the first. We denote:

- m_1, m_2 : masses at the ends of the first and second rods
- L_1, L_2 : lengths of the first and second rods
- g : gravitational acceleration

We choose generalized coordinates as the two angles measured from the downward vertical:

- θ_1 : angle of the first rod with respect to the vertical
- θ_2 : angle of the second rod with respect to the vertical

With this choice, $\theta_1 = 0$ corresponds to the first mass hanging straight down, and positive angles correspond to counterclockwise rotation. The second mass then has a position determined by both θ_1 and θ_2 , since it is attached to the end of the first rod.

The configuration space of the system is thus a two-dimensional torus, parameterized by θ_1 and θ_2 modulo 2π . The full state of the system in phase space is specified by the angles and their conjugate angular velocities or momenta, giving a four-dimensional state vector such as $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dot{\theta}_1, \dot{\theta}_2)$. It is this four-dimensional structure, together with the nonlinear constraints imposed by the rigid rods and gravity, that allows the double pendulum to exhibit chaotic behavior.

In many numerical and pedagogical treatments, one adopts dimensionless units by scaling lengths and times so that, for example, $L_1 = L_2 = 1$, $m_1 = m_2 = 1$, and $g = 1$. This reduces the number of independent parameters and emphasizes that chaos is a structural property of the equations, not a fine-tuned feature of particular parameter choices.

2.2 Equations of motion and energy conservation

The equations of motion for the double pendulum follow from the Lagrangian formulation. One writes the kinetic energy T and potential energy V in terms of the generalized coordinates and velocities, then applies the Euler–Lagrange equations. For the planar double pendulum with point masses and massless rods, the kinetic energy contains contributions from both masses moving in two dimensions, and the potential energy is determined by their vertical heights in the gravitational field.

Although the explicit formulas are somewhat lengthy, the structure is conceptually simple. The equations take the form of two coupled, nonlinear second-order ordinary differential equations:

- one equation for $\ddot{\theta}_1$ involving $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dot{\theta}_1$, and $\dot{\theta}_2$
- one equation for $\ddot{\theta}_2$ involving the same variables

The nonlinear coupling appears through trigonometric functions such as $\sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2)$ and $\cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2)$, reflecting the geometric relationship between the two rods. These terms ensure that the motion of one mass affects the other in a way that cannot be simplified to independent harmonic oscillators.

In the absence of friction or external driving, the system is conservative: the total mechanical energy $E = T + V$ is constant in time. For a given set of parameters and initial conditions, one can compute E at $t = 0$ and verify during numerical integration that it remains constant up to numerical error. This energy conservation provides an important diagnostic for the accuracy of the integrator and for the regime of motion. At low energies the motion is often regular and

nearly periodic; as the energy increases, the phase space develops regions where the trajectories exhibit chaotic wandering.

From a numerical perspective, the equations are most often written in first-order form by introducing velocity variables and then integrated using standard ODE solvers. The essential point for this paper is that the double pendulum dynamics are deterministic, time-reversible, and energy-conserving in the ideal model, but highly sensitive to initial conditions in certain energy ranges.

2.3 Typical chaotic regimes and qualitative behavior

The double pendulum does not exhibit chaos for all parameter values and energies. At very low energies, both rods swing with small amplitudes around the vertical and the motion is well approximated by coupled harmonic oscillators. Trajectories are regular and quasi-periodic; nearby initial conditions remain close in phase space for long times.

As the total energy is increased, the system passes through a sequence of dynamical regimes. When the energy becomes high enough for the lower mass to pass over the top pivot, new regions of phase space open up in which the lower rod can execute full rotations. In these regimes, Poincaré sections reveal the coexistence of regular islands (corresponding to quasi-periodic motion) and stochastic seas where trajectories wander in a complicated fashion. It is within these mixed or predominantly chaotic regions that the hallmark features of sensitivity to initial conditions are most pronounced.

Qualitatively, one can characterize typical chaotic behavior as follows. Two trajectories that start with nearly identical angles and angular velocities remain close for a short transient period, often executing a similar sequence of swings. Then, at some unpredictable swing or flip, one trajectory takes a different path: one mass might loop over the top while the other only oscillates, or the phase lag between the two rods changes abruptly. From that point onward, the two motions bear little resemblance to one another. This divergence happens even though the governing equations and parameters are identical; the only difference is the tiny initial perturbation.

In numerical experiments, this behavior translates into an initially small difference in phase-space coordinates that grows roughly exponentially for some time before saturating at a scale set by the typical size of the accessible region of phase space. The growth rate in the early phase is characterized by the largest Lyapunov exponent. For the purposes of the difference pendulum, it is this exponential growth and subsequent saturation that will drive the third pendulum from near rest into significant motion.

2.4 Numerical integration choices and accuracy considerations

Because the difference pendulum construction relies on comparing two simulations of the double pendulum, the choice of numerical integrator and its accuracy properties are directly relevant. Small numerical errors can themselves act like perturbations, so one must ensure that the divergence observed between the twin pendula A and B is dominated by genuine chaotic dynamics rather than artefacts of the integration scheme.

A common choice for integrating the double pendulum is a fourth-order Runge–Kutta method with a fixed time step. This method is simple to implement and, with sufficiently small step size, produces accurate trajectories over moderate time intervals. However, standard Runge–Kutta schemes do not explicitly preserve the Hamiltonian structure of the system, so small drifts in total energy can accumulate over long runs.

Symplectic integrators offer an alternative that more faithfully respect energy conservation and phase-space volume preservation in Hamiltonian systems. While the double pendulum's equations are somewhat more intricate than those of a simple harmonic oscillator, they can still be integrated using symplectic schemes or splitting methods that treat kinetic and potential contributions separately. For long-time studies of chaos and Lyapunov exponents, such methods can provide more reliable results.

Regardless of the integrator, several practical considerations apply:

- **Time step selection.** The time step must be small enough to resolve the fastest motions, especially when the lower mass executes rapid flips. Too large a step can smear out critical transitions and underestimate local curvature in phase space.
- **Floating-point precision.** Double precision is typically necessary to maintain accuracy when tracking tiny initial differences over many characteristic times. Single precision may introduce artificial divergence that contaminates estimates of sensitivity.
- **Energy monitoring.** Periodically checking the total energy allows one to diagnose whether energy drift is acceptable. If energy changes significantly over the time interval of interest, the integrator or time step should be revisited.
- **Consistency across twin simulations.** For the twin pendula A and B, it is important to use identical numerical schemes and step sizes, differing only in the intentional initial perturbation. This ensures that any divergence arises from the system's dynamics rather than from differences in numerical treatment.

In the later sections, when we define the difference pendulum and compute its response to the divergence of A and B, we will assume that these numerical best practices are in place. The goal

is not to explore numerical chaos, but to use a well-resolved numerical model of genuine dynamical chaos as the driver for our difference meter.

3. Twin Double Pendula and Difference Signals

To create a meaningful input for the difference pendulum, we first need two independent realizations of the same chaotic system. In this section we describe how to define twin double pendula with nearly identical initial conditions, how to quantify the separation between their trajectories in phase space, and how to extract from that separation a single scalar signal that will be used to drive the third pendulum. We close by recalling the expected exponential growth of small differences in chaotic regimes, which underlies the intended behavior of the difference pendulum as a Lyapunov meter.

3.1 Defining pendula A and B with nearly identical initial conditions

We consider two copies of the same planar double pendulum, labeled A and B. Both are defined by the same physical parameters:

- masses m_1, m_2
- lengths L_1, L_2
- gravitational acceleration g

and both obey the same equations of motion, integrated using the same numerical scheme and time step. The only intentional difference between A and B lies in their initial conditions.

For each pendulum we specify an initial state in phase space:

- pendulum A: $(\theta_{1A}(0), \theta_{2A}(0), \omega_{1A}(0), \omega_{2A}(0))$
- pendulum B: $(\theta_{1B}(0), \theta_{2B}(0), \omega_{1B}(0), \omega_{2B}(0))$

To probe sensitivity to initial conditions, we choose these so that:

- the angles and angular velocities are identical to within a small perturbation, or
- one coordinate is offset by a tiny amount, while the others are exactly matched.

For example, one might define a reference initial state x_0 and then set:

- pendulum A: $x_A(0) = x_0$
- pendulum B: $x_B(0) = x_0 + \delta x(0)$

where $\delta x(0)$ has only one nonzero component, such as a small change in θ_2 of a few micro radians. The magnitude of this perturbation should be small enough that the two trajectories are effectively indistinguishable at $t = 0$, but large enough to exceed floating-point noise and be numerically resolvable.

In practice, one often chooses initial conditions that place the pendulum in a known chaotic regime: for instance, both rods initially displaced from the vertical with sufficient energy for the lower arm to execute occasional full rotations. Within this regime, even very small differences in initial conditions are amplified by the dynamics over time, providing a clean source of divergence for the difference pendulum to detect.

3.2 Phase-space distance measures between trajectories

Once pendula A and B are defined, we can think of their states at time t as points in a four-dimensional phase space:

- $x_A(t) = (\theta_{1A}, \theta_{2A}, \omega_{1A}, \omega_{2A})$
- $x_B(t) = (\theta_{1B}, \theta_{2B}, \omega_{1B}, \omega_{2B})$

The simplest way to quantify their separation is to define a phase-space difference vector:

- $\delta x(t) = x_B(t) - x_A(t)$

and a corresponding norm, for example the Euclidean norm in this four-dimensional space. Explicitly, one could write:

- $$d_{\text{phase}}(t) = \sqrt{w_{\theta} * (\theta_{1B} - \theta_{1A})^2 + w_{\theta} * (\theta_{2B} - \theta_{2A})^2 + w_{\omega} * (\omega_{1B} - \omega_{1A})^2 + w_{\omega} * (\omega_{2B} - \omega_{2A})^2}$$

with weights w_{θ} and w_{ω} chosen to balance the contributions of angles and angular velocities. In a dimensionless formulation, setting these weights to unity is often sufficient.

There is no unique “correct” distance measure; different choices emphasize different aspects of the divergence. One might, for example, weight angular velocities more heavily if one is interested in the phase relationship between the rods, or choose a metric that is invariant under adding the same constant angle to both θ_1 and θ_2 . In this paper, the phase-space norm mainly serves as a conceptual reference: it is the abstract quantity whose growth rate defines the Lyapunov exponent.

In the difference pendulum construction, we will not feed this full norm directly into the third pendulum. Instead, we will extract from the twin trajectories a simpler scalar signal that is more

directly linked to a physical quantity, such as the separation of the lower masses in Cartesian space. Nevertheless, the phase-space distance provides an underlying mathematical picture of what “difference” means in this context.

3.3 Practical scalar difference signals: angle differences, Cartesian separations

To drive the difference pendulum, we require a scalar function of time $s(t)$ that is zero when A and B are exactly synchronized and nonzero when they differ. This function should be straightforward to compute from the twin trajectories and should respond in a reasonably monotonic way to their divergence, at least in the early stages. Several practical choices are available.

One natural option is an angle-based difference, for example:

- $s(t) = \theta_{2B}(t) - \theta_{2A}(t)$

which measures how far out of phase the lower rods have become. This choice is easy to implement but requires care with angle wrapping: because angles are defined modulo 2π , a small difference near the branch cut can appear as a large difference numerically. One can mitigate this by mapping angle differences into a principal range, such as $(-\pi, \pi]$, before using them.

Another option is to work in Cartesian coordinates. The horizontal position of the lower mass of pendulum A can be written as $x_{2A}(t)$, derived from θ_{1A} and θ_{2A} ; similarly for B. Then:

- $s(t) = x_{2B}(t) - x_{2A}(t)$

gives the horizontal separation of the two lower masses. Compared to raw angle differences, this quantity is less sensitive to angle wrapping and has a direct geometric interpretation. One can likewise use vertical separation, or the Euclidean distance in the plane:

- $s_{\text{abs}}(t) = \sqrt{(x_{2B} - x_{2A})^2 + (y_{2B} - y_{2A})^2}$

if one is willing to discard the sign. For the difference pendulum, a signed signal is often preferable, because it allows the third pendulum to be driven in opposite directions depending on which of the two base pendula is leading.

A third class of signals combines positions and velocities. For instance, one might define $s(t)$ as a weighted sum of horizontal separation and relative velocity, or as a projection of $\delta x(t)$ onto some preferred direction in phase space. These more elaborate signals can, in principle, be tuned to emphasize particular aspects of divergence, but they add complexity without necessarily improving the pedagogical clarity.

In the simplest version of the difference pendulum, we will imagine $s(t)$ as a signed Cartesian separation, such as $x_{2B} - x_{2A}$. This choice is enough to ensure that small differences in the states of A and B translate into small forcing on the third pendulum, while large, irregular differences drive it strongly. The key requirement is that $s(t)$ start near zero and grow as chaos separates the twin trajectories.

3.4 Expected exponential growth of small differences in chaotic regimes

In a chaotic regime, a small initial difference $\delta x(0)$ between trajectories of a deterministic system grows approximately exponentially with time, at least over some finite window.

Formally, one writes:

- $|\delta x(t)| \approx |\delta x(0)| \cdot \exp(\lambda \cdot t)$

where λ is the largest Lyapunov exponent. This relation holds for sufficiently small initial separation and for times short enough that the difference remains small compared to the size of the accessible region of phase space. Beyond that window, nonlinear saturation effects flatten the growth, and the trajectories become effectively uncorrelated within the region they explore.

The scalar signal $s(t)$ derived from A and B will reflect this growth pattern in a filtered way. If $s(t)$ is proportional to a component of $\delta x(t)$, then at early times we expect:

- $|s(t)|$ roughly scales like $|s(0)| \cdot \exp(\lambda \cdot t)$

until the magnitude of $s(t)$ becomes comparable to the typical scale of motion (for example, until the lower masses are significantly separated in configuration space). After that, $|s(t)|$ will fluctuate irregularly within a bounded range, reflecting the complex structure of the chaotic attractor or accessible energy surface.

For the difference pendulum, this behavior has a clear interpretation. When A and B start nearly identical, $s(t)$ is very small, and the driving force on the third pendulum is negligible. As $\exp(\lambda \cdot t)$ amplifies the initial difference, $s(t)$ grows and begins to exert noticeable forcing. The time at which the difference pendulum's amplitude departs significantly from zero corresponds roughly to the time when the separation between A and B has grown from microscopic to macroscopic scales. In other words, the time at which the difference pendulum “wakes up” provides a visual and dynamical measure of the predictability horizon for the twin double pendula.

In later sections, we will use this intuition to design the parameters of the difference pendulum so that its response is sensitive to the early exponential growth without being overwhelmed by the subsequent saturated fluctuations. This tuning allows the device to serve as a practical Lyapunov meter in numerical experiments and as a clear visual representation of how quickly nearby trajectories part ways in a chaotic system.

4. The Difference Pendulum Model

The core of the construction is a third, virtual pendulum D that does not represent a separate chaotic system of its own, but rather serves as an instrument that responds to the evolving discrepancy between pendula A and B. Conceptually, D is a simple driven oscillator with one degree of freedom, coupled to the difference signal extracted from the twin double pendula. When A and B remain closely aligned, the forcing on D is negligible and it behaves like a nearly stationary pendulum. As A and B part company in phase space, the forcing grows, and D is excited into larger, more irregular motion. By choosing the parameters of D appropriately, we can make its early-time response approximately proportional to the exponential growth of the A–B difference, while allowing its long-time behavior to saturate in a visually interpretable way.

4.1 Introducing a third virtual pendulum D with angle $\phi(t)$

We model the difference pendulum D as a single planar pendulum with angle $\phi(t)$ measured from the downward vertical. Its configuration is fully specified by $\phi(t)$, and its state in phase space by $(\phi(t), \dot{\phi}(t))$. In the absence of any forcing from the twin pendula, D would obey the familiar dynamics of a damped pendulum: it would relax toward the vertical under gravity, with small oscillations decaying over time if damping is present.

In the virtual setting, D is not bound by mechanical constraints, but it is useful to think of it as having an effective length and mass, leading to an effective moment of inertia I_D and a natural frequency of small oscillations. The exact values of these parameters do not have to correspond to any physical apparatus; rather, they are knobs that control how quickly and how strongly D responds to the input signal from A and B. Treating D as a standard pendulum keeps the model intuitive and makes its motion easy to visualize alongside the more complex motions of the double pendula.

4.2 Driven, damped pendulum equation with forcing from A–B difference

The dynamics of the difference pendulum D are governed by a driven, damped pendulum equation. In its simplest form, one can write

$$I_D \cdot \ddot{\phi}(t) + \gamma \cdot \dot{\phi}(t) + k \cdot \sin(\phi(t)) = \alpha \cdot s(t),$$

where:

- I_D is the effective moment of inertia of D
- γ is a damping coefficient
- k sets the strength of the gravitational restoring torque (and thus the natural frequency)
- α is a coupling coefficient

- $s(t)$ is the scalar difference signal derived from A and B, such as $x_{2B}(t) - x_{2A}(t)$

The left-hand side represents the intrinsic dynamics of a pendulum subject to gravity and damping. The right-hand side is the external torque generated by the difference between the twin double pendula. When $s(t)$ is zero, D behaves like a damped pendulum that comes to rest near $\phi = 0$. When $s(t)$ is small but nonzero, D undergoes small forced oscillations. As $s(t)$ grows and becomes more irregular due to chaotic divergence, D can be driven into large, complex motion.

In practice, it is convenient to rewrite this equation in first-order form and integrate it numerically alongside the equations for A and B. At each time step, the simulation computes $s(t)$ from the current states of A and B, evaluates the right-hand side, and updates $\phi(t)$ and $\dot{\phi}(t)$. Importantly, in the basic design D does not feed back into A or B; the coupling is one-way. This ensures that D functions purely as a readout device, not as an additional element that alters the base chaotic dynamics.

4.3 Choice of parameters: natural frequency, damping, and coupling strength

The behavior of the difference pendulum is shaped by three main parameter choices: its natural frequency, its damping, and its coupling strength to the difference signal. These parameters should be chosen in relation to the characteristic time scales and amplitudes of the A–B divergence.

The natural frequency, set by k and I_D , determines how quickly D can respond. If D is too stiff and fast, it may oscillate rapidly in response to even modest fluctuations in $s(t)$, making its motion visually noisy and hard to interpret. If it is too soft and slow, it may lag behind the growth of $s(t)$ and fail to exhibit a clear early-time response. A reasonable strategy is to choose the natural period of D to be comparable to a few swing periods of the lower arm of the double pendulum, so that its motion evolves on a similar time scale.

The damping γ controls how energy injected by the forcing term is dissipated. With no damping, D could accumulate energy indefinitely, leading to unbounded growth in amplitude that obscures the relationship with the underlying difference signal. With too much damping, D will barely move, even when $s(t)$ becomes large. An intermediate damping level is desirable, such that small early-time forcing produces visibly growing oscillations, but long-time forcing leads to a saturation of amplitude rather than runaway growth. This saturation makes it easier to interpret the moment when D transitions from near rest to active motion as the point where A and B have diverged significantly.

The coupling strength α scales how strongly a given $s(t)$ drives D. If α is too small, D will remain nearly quiescent throughout the simulation. If α is too large, even very small early-time differences between A and B will produce large swings in D, compressing the useful

dynamic range. Tuning α so that early exponential growth in $s(t)$ translates into an order-of-magnitude growth in D amplitude over a visible time window allows the difference pendulum to act as a sensitive yet interpretable indicator of divergence.

4.4 Interpreting D 's energy and amplitude as a Lyapunov meter

The central interpretive move in this construction is to treat the energy or amplitude of the difference pendulum as a proxy for the separation between A and B in phase space. At early times, when the forcing is weak and the response of D is approximately linear, one can expect the amplitude of $\phi(t)$ to track the magnitude of $s(t)$ up to a proportionality factor determined by α , γ , and the natural frequency. If $s(t)$ is itself proportional to a component of the phase-space difference $\delta x(t)$, then the growth of D 's amplitude reflects the exponential growth governed by the largest Lyapunov exponent.

More concretely, one can monitor an energy-like quantity for D , such as

$$E_D(t) = (1/2) * I_D * \dot{\phi}(t)^2 + k * (1 - \cos(\phi(t))),$$

which combines kinetic and potential energy terms. At early times, when $\phi(t)$ is small, $E_D(t)$ is approximately quadratic in ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$. Under weak forcing, the rate of growth of $E_D(t)$ should be related to the square of the amplitude of $s(t)$, and thus to $\exp(2 * \lambda * t)$ in a chaotic regime. By fitting an exponential to the early-time growth of $E_D(t)$ on a logarithmic scale, one can, in principle, estimate an effective Lyapunov rate without directly computing $\delta x(t)$.

Even when such quantitative fitting is not performed, watching D 's motion in an animation conveys the key qualitative message. The moment when D 's oscillations become clearly noticeable corresponds to the time at which the initially tiny difference between A and B has grown to a macroscopic scale. The subsequent saturation and irregular behavior of D track the saturation and complex wandering of A and B 's separation in phase space. In this sense, the difference pendulum acts as a Lyapunov meter that translates an abstract exponential divergence into a third, more easily read degree of freedom.

4.5 Variants: linear vs nonlinear restoring forces, alternative drivings

The simple driven, damped pendulum model for D is not the only possible choice. One natural variant is to linearize the restoring force, replacing $k * \sin(\phi)$ with $k * \phi$ for all amplitudes. This turns D into a driven, damped linear oscillator with equation

$$I_D * \ddot{\phi} + \gamma * \dot{\phi} + k * \phi = \alpha * s(t).$$

In this linear regime, the response of D to $s(t)$ can be analyzed using standard tools for forced oscillators, and the relationship between the spectral properties of $s(t)$ and the motion of D

becomes especially clear. However, the loss of nonlinearity also removes some of the visual richness of the motion at large amplitudes and may make D's long-time behavior less intuitively "pendulum-like."

Another class of variants modifies the way in which the difference signal enters the forcing term. Instead of coupling directly to $s(t)$, one might use its time derivative, $\dot{s}(t)$, capturing the rate at which A and B are moving apart. Alternatively, one can use a nonlinear function of $s(t)$, such as $\alpha * \tanh(s(t) / s_0)$, which saturates the driving torque when the difference becomes large, providing an intrinsic bound on D's response without relying solely on damping.

One can also consider multiple difference modes. For example, two independent difference pendula, D_x and D_y , could be driven separately by horizontal and vertical separations, or by angle and angular velocity differences. Their combined motion would provide a richer picture of how different aspects of the A–B divergence unfold over time. More elaborate constructions might replace the single pendulum D with a small network of coupled oscillators, each driven by a different component of $\delta x(t)$, forming a kind of mechanical spectrum analyzer of chaos.

These variants all preserve the fundamental idea: a third, simpler degree of freedom receives as input a measure of the evolving difference between two chaotic systems and expresses that difference as its own motion. The particular form of the restoring force and the driving function can be chosen to emphasize different pedagogical or analytical goals, but the core role of the difference pendulum as a Lyapunov meter remains.

5. Numerical Experiment Protocol

The difference pendulum construction is most naturally explored as a numerical experiment. In this section we describe a practical protocol for simulating the twin double pendula A and B together with the driven pendulum D. The goal is not to optimize performance or derive rigorous Lyapunov exponents, but to specify a clear, reproducible procedure that demonstrates how D behaves as a Lyapunov meter. We outline how to initialize the system with a small perturbation, how to integrate all three subsystems simultaneously, how to quantify divergence via the amplitude of D, and how to extract an effective Lyapunov rate from its early-time growth. Finally, we discuss the robustness of this behavior under noise, discretization effects, and parameter changes.

5.1 Initialization: small perturbations between A and B

The first step is to choose initial conditions for the twin double pendula that place them in a chaotic regime while remaining nearly identical at $t = 0$. A typical procedure is as follows:

1. Pick a reference state x_0 for a single double pendulum. For example:

- $\theta_1(0) = \theta_{1_ref}$
- $\theta_2(0) = \theta_{2_ref}$
- $\omega_1(0) = \omega_{1_ref}$
- $\omega_2(0) = \omega_{2_ref}$

where the chosen angles and angular velocities give a total energy high enough for the lower rod to occasionally rotate fully.

2. Define a small perturbation $\delta x(0)$. For simplicity, one can perturb a single coordinate:

- $\delta \theta_2(0) = \epsilon$
- $\delta \theta_1(0) = 0$
- $\delta \omega_1(0) = 0$
- $\delta \omega_2(0) = 0$

with ϵ on the order of 10^{-6} to 10^{-4} radians in double precision. This scale is small enough that the two initial configurations are visually indistinguishable yet large enough to avoid being erased by roundoff.

3. Initialize pendulum A exactly at the reference state:

- $x_A(0) = x_0$

4. Initialize pendulum B at the perturbed state:

- $x_B(0) = x_0 + \delta x(0)$

5. Initialize the difference pendulum D at rest near its equilibrium:

- $\phi(0) = 0$
- $\dot{\phi}(0) = 0$

This setup guarantees that at $t = 0$ the difference between A and B is entirely controlled by ϵ . All subsequent divergence arises from the intrinsic chaotic dynamics, not from any intentional difference in parameters or integration scheme. The difference pendulum starts in a quiescent state, ready to respond to whatever forcing the A–B mismatch produces.

5.2 Time stepping: simultaneous integration of A, B, and D

With initial conditions specified, the next step is to integrate the equations of motion for A, B, and D forward in time. The key requirement is that all three systems be advanced using the same time step, so that the difference signal $s(t)$ is computed consistently.

A practical protocol is:

1. Choose a time step dt that adequately resolves the fastest expected motion of the double pendulum. For many parameter choices, dt in the range 10^{-3} to 10^{-2} (in natural units) provides a reasonable balance between accuracy and computational cost.
2. At each time step n , with time $t_n = n * dt$, perform the following sequence:
 - Evaluate the state of A: $x_A(t_n)$
 - Evaluate the state of B: $x_B(t_n)$
 - Compute the difference signal:
 - $s(t_n) = x_{2B}(t_n) - x_{2A}(t_n)$, if using horizontal separation
 - Evaluate the right-hand side of D's equation of motion:
 - $f_D = (\alpha * s(t_n) - \gamma * \dot{\phi}(t_n) - k * \sin(\phi(t_n))) / I_D$
 - Update x_A , x_B , and $(\phi, \dot{\phi})$ to time t_{n+1} using the chosen integrator.
3. Use the same integration method for all three subsystems. For example, a fourth-order Runge–Kutta scheme can be applied independently to the equations of motion for A, B, and D, with the understanding that D's forcing depends on the states of A and B evaluated at t_n .
4. At regular intervals, record:
 - The full states of A and B (for visualization or diagnostics)
 - The scalar signal $s(t_n)$
 - The difference pendulum angle $\phi(t_n)$ and velocity $\dot{\phi}(t_n)$

By integrating all three subsystems in lockstep, the simulation produces a consistent time series of difference signals and responses. The one-way coupling from A and B into D makes the code modular: the double pendulum integrator can be written and verified independently before adding the difference pendulum layer.

5.3 Measuring divergence: D amplitude thresholds and saturation

The behavior of the difference pendulum over time provides an immediate qualitative picture of how A and B separate in phase space. To make this more precise, we can define simple metrics based on the amplitude of $\phi(t)$.

One straightforward measure is the maximum absolute angle reached by D up to time t :

- $A_D(t) = \max_{\{0 \leq \tau \leq t\}} |\phi(\tau)|.$

At very early times, when $s(t)$ is still extremely small, $A_D(t)$ will remain near zero. As the difference between A and B grows and the forcing becomes significant, $A_D(t)$ will begin to rise. Eventually, as $s(t)$ enters a saturated, irregular regime, $A_D(t)$ will approach a plateau determined by the balance between energy input and damping.

In a numerical experiment, one can define an amplitude threshold A_{thresh} that marks the onset of “visible” divergence. For example, A_{thresh} might be chosen as a small fraction of a radian, such as 0.05 or 0.1, corresponding to a few degrees of swing. The time t_{wake} at which $A_D(t)$ first exceeds A_{thresh} is then a practical measure of how long it takes for the initially tiny difference between A and B to become dynamically significant.

Beyond this threshold, the amplitude of D will continue to fluctuate as the forcing signal $s(t)$ explores its full chaotic range. The damping γ ensures that these fluctuations do not cause indefinite growth; instead, $A_D(t)$ will gradually approach a saturation value A_{sat} . This saturated amplitude reflects the typical strength of the difference signal and the balance between driving and dissipation in D. For pedagogical purposes, the contrast between the near-zero early behavior and the large saturated swings is more important than the precise value of A_{sat} .

The two quantities t_{wake} and A_{sat} provide complementary views of divergence. The wake-up time emphasizes the predictability horizon: how long two nearly identical systems remain effectively indistinguishable. The saturated amplitude emphasizes the eventual extent of their de-correlation: how far apart typical trajectories end up, in the sense relevant to the chosen difference signal.

5.4 Estimating effective Lyapunov rates from D’s early-time growth

If one wishes to move from qualitative visualization to a more quantitative estimate of sensitivity, the early-time growth of the difference pendulum’s energy or amplitude can be analyzed in the spirit of Lyapunov exponent calculations.

A simple method is:

1. Focus on an early time window $[0, t_{\text{fit}}]$ during which:

- The amplitude of D remains small enough that its response is approximately linear.
 - The difference signal $s(t)$ is dominated by the exponential growth of the A–B separation, not yet affected by saturation.
2. Compute an energy-like quantity for D at each time step in this window, for example:
 - $E_D(t_n) = 0.5 * I_D * \dot{\phi}(t_n)^2 + k * (1 - \cos(\phi(t_n)))$.

For small ϕ , this approximates a quadratic form in ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$.

3. Discard the initial transient where E_D is essentially at numerical noise level, and consider only times where $E_D(t)$ is clearly above numerical floor but still in the small-amplitude regime.
4. Plot $\ln(E_D(t))$ versus t in this window and fit a straight line:
 - $\ln(E_D(t)) \approx a + b * t$.
5. Interpret the fitted slope b as an effective growth rate related to twice the largest Lyapunov exponent of the underlying double pendulum, since energy scales roughly as amplitude squared:
 - $b \approx 2 * \lambda_{\text{eff}}$.

This procedure is approximate and depends on the choice of difference signal, coupling strength, and fit window. It is not a replacement for standard Lyapunov exponent algorithms, which operate directly on the phase-space separation $\delta x(t)$. However, it illustrates how the information about exponential sensitivity is encoded in the motion of D. The fact that one can recover a reasonable growth rate from the energy of a driven pendulum supports the interpretation of D as a Lyapunov meter.

A similar analysis can be done using the amplitude $A_D(t)$ instead of energy. For small oscillations, $A_D(t)$ should scale as $\exp(\lambda_{\text{eff}} * t)$ during the linear response regime. Fitting $\ln(A_D)$ versus t yields an estimate for λ_{eff} . Energy-based fits are often smoother, but amplitude-based fits may be more intuitive in visualizations.

5.5 Robustness to noise, discretization, and parameter changes

Any numerical construction that relies on chaotic dynamics must contend with the fact that chaos amplifies not only physical perturbations but also numerical artefacts. For the difference pendulum, this sensitivity raises natural questions about robustness. To what extent does the behavior of D truly reflect the dynamics of the double pendulum system, rather than the quirks of a particular integration scheme or parameter choice?

Several observations suggest that the qualitative features of D's behavior are robust:

1. Discretization and integrator choice.

If the time step dt is reduced by a factor of two and the integration scheme remains the same, the detailed trajectories of A and B will differ, but the overall pattern of early exponential error growth and subsequent saturation should persist. The wake-up time t_{wake} may shift slightly, and the fitted λ_{eff} may change within some tolerance, but D will still exhibit the characteristic transition from near rest to vigorous motion. Using a symplectic integrator instead of a standard Runge–Kutta scheme can reduce long-term energy drift in A and B, but the difference pendulum's qualitative response remains similar.

2. Floating-point precision.

Switching from double to higher precision changes the scale of roundoff noise, effectively altering the smallest perturbations that can grow under chaos. However, since the initial perturbation between A and B is imposed explicitly, and chosen to be much larger than machine epsilon, the early-time dynamics of $s(t)$ and D are dominated by the intentional perturbation, not by numerical noise. The exact details of long-time saturation may differ slightly, but the main qualitative features are preserved.

3. Noise in the difference signal.

If small random noise is added to $s(t)$, representing measurement uncertainty or modelling error, the early exponential growth may become slightly smeared, but the overall trend remains. Because D is driven by a time series that is already intricate and irregular, small additional noise does not qualitatively alter its motion. In fact, a modest noise level can make the robustness of the construction more apparent: D still wakes up when A and B diverge, even in the presence of perturbations.

4. Parameter variations in D.

Changing the natural frequency, damping, or coupling strength within reasonable ranges alters the sensitivity and visual character of D's response but does not remove the basic behavior. A stiffer, more lightly damped D will show faster and more oscillatory growth; a softer, more heavily damped D will respond more sluggishly. In both cases, the transition from negligible motion to persistent, significant swings remains, as long as the parameters are not tuned to trivial extremes (zero coupling or overwhelming damping).

5. Alternative difference signals.

Replacing the horizontal separation $x_{2B} - x_{2A}$ with another scalar measure, such as angle difference or full Euclidean distance in the plane, changes the detailed shape of $s(t)$. Yet any such signal that reflects the underlying exponential divergence will lead to a

qualitatively similar driven response in D. The precise numerical value of λ_{eff} extracted from D's energy may depend on the choice of signal, but the pedagogical function of D as a difference meter remains intact.

Taken together, these considerations suggest that the difference pendulum is a robust numerical device. It does not require fine tuning to reveal the separation of nearby trajectories; rather, its behavior is a generic consequence of coupling a simple driven oscillator to an exponentially growing difference signal. The details of the implementation can be adjusted to suit computational resources and visualization preferences, without undermining the core purpose of making Lyapunov growth visible and intuitive.

6. Visualization and mp4 Design

Beyond equations and plots, the difference pendulum becomes most compelling when it is seen in motion. A carefully designed animation can make the divergence between twin double pendula and the response of the difference pendulum immediately intelligible to a wide audience. In this section we outline a practical visualization design as if one were preparing an mp4 animation for teaching or presentation. The aim is not to prescribe a particular software tool, but to specify the visual structure, color scheme, annotations, and auxiliary plots that together make the underlying dynamics clear.

6.1 Layout with three panels: A, B, and D

A natural starting point is a three-panel layout that presents all three pendula simultaneously. A simple arrangement is:

- Left panel: double pendulum A
- Middle panel: double pendulum B
- Right panel: difference pendulum D

Each panel shows a planar view of the corresponding pendulum, with the fixed pivot at the top and the rods and masses drawn as lines and circles. For A and B, the geometry is identical; only the motion differs. For D, a single rod or point mass is sufficient. This side-by-side arrangement lets the viewer compare the motions of A and B directly and see D's response without switching contexts.

To maintain visual balance, the three panels can be given equal width, with some spacing between them. A shared time axis governs all three, so that a single time counter at the top or bottom of the frame applies to every panel. If the mp4 is intended for full HD resolution, each

panel might occupy roughly one third of the horizontal space, leaving room for textual overlays and small auxiliary plots without crowding.

The panels can be further unified by including a faint grid or frame around each, making it clear where one subsystem ends and another begins. Labels such as “Pendulum A,” “Pendulum B,” and “Difference pendulum D” placed unobtrusively near the top of each panel help orient the viewer.

6.2 Color and camera choices for intuitive comparison

Color choices and viewpoint should reinforce the conceptual relationships between A, B, and D. A simple scheme is:

- Use the same color for the rods and masses of A and B, for example white or light gray, emphasizing that they are physically identical systems.
- Use a distinct accent color for D, such as blue or cyan, to highlight its role as a separate readout device.
- Use a dark background to maximize contrast and reduce visual noise.

To help the viewer see which parts of A and B correspond to the difference signal, the lower masses can be given small colored markers, for instance red outlines. Their horizontal positions $x_{2A}(t)$ and $x_{2B}(t)$ are what feed into the difference signal $s(t)$ in a simple implementation. When A and B move in phase, these markers nearly overlap; as they diverge, the separation becomes visible even before the difference pendulum responds strongly.

The camera view can remain fixed throughout the animation, centered on each pendulum’s pivot with a zoom level chosen so that the full range of motion is always visible. A small coordinate cross or vertical reference line can be included behind A and B to make angle differences more apparent. For D, a vertical reference line at $\phi = 0$ makes it easy to see when the difference pendulum departs significantly from its equilibrium.

Smooth, continuous motion at a frame rate of 30 frames per second helps avoid stroboscopic artefacts. If computational constraints require sub-sampling the simulation, intermediate frames can be interpolated to keep the animation visually fluid.

6.3 Time overlays and annotations for divergence events

Textual overlays and simple annotations can greatly enhance the viewer’s understanding of what is happening and when. A few key elements are:

- A global time counter, displayed in one corner of the frame, showing the simulation time t in natural units or seconds.

- An indication of the current difference signal $s(t)$, perhaps as a small numerical readout or a horizontal bar whose length is proportional to $|s(t)|$.
- Markers for notable events, such as the time when the difference pendulum's amplitude first exceeds a chosen threshold.

For example, one could define a threshold amplitude A_{thresh} and display an unobtrusive message when the maximum absolute angle of D surpasses it for the first time: “Difference pendulum wakes up at $t \approx 3.2$.” A vertical line can be drawn on any accompanying plots (see below) at this time, reinforcing the notion of a predictability horizon.

Additional annotations might include:

- A small subtitle at the beginning of the animation explaining that the initial difference between A and B is tiny and invisible at $t = 0$.
- Brief captions at key moments (“Trajectories begin to diverge,” “Difference pendulum enters saturated regime”) that fade in and out without interrupting the flow.

The goal is to guide the viewer's attention without overloading the screen. Annotations should be sparse and timed to coincide with visually obvious changes, so that text and motion tell the same story.

6.4 Additional plots: D amplitude vs time and log-scale growth

To complement the physical images of the pendula, it is useful to dedicate a small portion of the frame to one or two simple plots that update in real time as the simulation proceeds. Two particularly informative quantities are:

- The instantaneous amplitude or angle of the difference pendulum, $|\phi(t)|$.
- An energy-like quantity for D, $E_D(t)$, plotted on a logarithmic vertical scale.

These plots can be placed below or above the panels, occupying a narrow horizontal strip. As the animation plays, a vertical cursor moves across each plot in sync with the global time, showing the history of D's motion up to the current frame.

In the amplitude plot, one expects to see $|\phi(t)|$ near zero initially, then rising as the forcing grows, and finally fluctuating around a plateau. A horizontal line indicating the threshold A_{thresh} makes it easy to see when D crosses from the “quiet” regime into the “active” regime. This visual reinforces the interpretation of t_{wake} as the point where the initial perturbation between A and B has been amplified to a macroscopic scale.

In the energy plot, using a logarithmic vertical axis highlights the early exponential growth. If the system is configured so that D's response is approximately linear in the early window, the log of

$E_D(t)$ should appear as a nearly straight line during that period. Even if the viewer does not perform a numerical fit, the appearance of a straight segment before saturation conveys the idea that the difference pendulum is responding to an exponentially growing input. When the curve bends and flattens, the viewer sees the onset of saturation and the transition to a fully developed chaotic regime.

6.5 Using the animation as a teaching tool for sensitive dependence

The designed mp4 is more than a numerical artifact; it can be used as a structured teaching tool for sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Several pedagogical strategies suggest themselves:

1. **Before-and-after comparison.**

One can show a short clip of A and B only, without D, and ask students whether the systems are identical. At early times, the answer will be “yes” by inspection. Then, after revealing the three-panel animation, students see that the difference pendulum was already registering tiny differences, anticipating the divergence that later becomes obvious in A and B.

2. **Predictability horizon.**

By pausing the animation at the moment when D first exceeds the amplitude threshold, instructors can discuss the notion of a predictability horizon: the time scale beyond which a small uncertainty in initial conditions has grown enough to affect observable outcomes. The time t_{wake} provides a concrete anchor for this discussion.

3. **Exponential vs saturated regimes.**

The log-scale energy plot allows a natural transition from visual observation to quantitative analysis. Students can be invited to trace the straight portion of the curve and infer that the system is experiencing exponential growth in that window, then relate this to the idea of a positive Lyapunov exponent. The later flattening of the curve illustrates how growth cannot continue indefinitely and how chaos remains bounded.

4. **Robustness and parameter exploration.**

In an interactive setting, one can vary the initial perturbation, damping, or coupling strength and replay the animation. Students see that while details change, the overall pattern remains: a quiet difference pendulum, a rapid transition, and a saturated, noisy regime. This robustness helps distinguish structural features of chaos from artefacts of a particular numerical setup.

5. **Metaphorical extensions.**

Finally, the difference pendulum offers a concrete metaphor for diverging realities. Instructors can connect the image of two nearly identical systems drifting apart and a

third indicator that “goes wild” to broader ideas about forecasting in weather, engineering tolerance, and the limits of long-term prediction in complex systems.

In this way, the mp4 is not merely an illustration of a particular numerical experiment. It becomes a reusable visual narrative that takes audiences from raw motion through diagnostic plots to conceptual understanding of sensitive dependence and Lyapunov growth.

7. Extensions and Variants

The basic difference pendulum construction already offers a clear picture of how small deviations between chaotic trajectories grow and saturate. However, it is only one point in a much larger design space. By changing the structure of the readout, introducing feedback, or replacing the underlying chaotic system, one can explore a variety of extended scenarios that illuminate different aspects of sensitivity, coupling, and randomness. This section sketches several such variants. They are not required for the core idea, but they suggest directions for further work, including multi-channel diagnostics, closed-loop dynamics, and hybrid quantum–classical interpretations.

7.1 Multiple difference modes: separate D_x and D_y pendula

In the simplest implementation, the difference signal $s(t)$ is a single scalar, for example the horizontal separation of the lower masses $x_{2B}(t) - x_{2A}(t)$. This collapses a fundamentally multicomponent discrepancy between A and B into a one-dimensional forcing. A natural extension is to retain more structure by introducing multiple difference modes, each with its own driven pendulum.

A straightforward case uses two difference pendula:

- D_x driven by the horizontal separation $s_x(t) = x_{2B}(t) - x_{2A}(t)$
- D_y driven by the vertical separation $s_y(t) = y_{2B}(t) - y_{2A}(t)$

Each difference pendulum obeys its own driven, damped equation with parameters tuned for a clear response. In an animation, one might place D_x and D_y in a small cluster and watch how their amplitudes evolve together. Early on, both remain near rest. As A and B diverge, one may see patterns such as:

- D_x waking up substantially earlier than D_y if the initial perturbation primarily affects horizontal motion.
- D_y responding more strongly in regimes where the lower masses frequently pass over the top and vertical displacement differences become large.

This two-channel design makes the vector character of the difference more apparent. Rather than a single scalar “how different,” one observes a small “difference vector” expressed by the pair of oscillators. The idea can be generalized further: a small array of driven oscillators could each be assigned a different scalar projection of the phase-space separation, such as angle differences, angular velocity differences, or combinations thereof. The resulting pattern of excitation across the array encodes a richer snapshot of how and where the twin trajectories diverge.

7.2 Feedback variants where D perturbs A and B

Up to this point, the coupling has been one-way: A and B drive D, and D does not influence A or B. This clean separation is ideal for using the difference pendulum as a diagnostic, but it is not the only interesting configuration. One can also explore feedback variants in which D, once excited, perturbs the base pendula.

Conceptually, feedback can be introduced by allowing the angle $\phi(t)$ or its time derivative to affect a physical parameter of A and B. For example:

- The pivot of pendulum A might be displaced slightly to the left or right depending on $\phi(t)$, while the pivot of B is displaced in the opposite direction.
- A small torque proportional to $\phi(t)$ could be applied to one of the joints of A and an equal and opposite torque to the corresponding joint of B.

In either case, the difference pendulum, initially quiescent, begins to influence the base systems only once it has been driven away from equilibrium by their divergence. This creates a closed feedback loop:

1. A and B, starting nearly identical, diverge due to chaos.
2. Their difference drives D into motion.
3. The motion of D modifies A and B’s future motion, potentially increasing or decreasing their divergence.

Depending on the sign and strength of the feedback, the effect on long-term behavior can be quite different. Weak, negative feedback might act as a partial stabilizer, nudging A and B back toward each other and slowing divergence in some regions of phase space. Strong, positive feedback could instead accelerate divergence, turning small differences into violent instabilities and creating a more dramatic form of unpredictability.

Exploring these regimes numerically would reveal how sensitive dependence behaves when difference is not merely observed but also re-injected into the system. From a conceptual

standpoint, this makes the difference pendulum an active participant rather than a passive meter, closer to a model of coupled chaotic systems in which monitoring and control interact.

7.3 Alternative chaotic bases: driven pendula, triple pendula, coupled rotors

The choice of the double pendulum as the base chaotic system is motivated by its familiarity and visual appeal, but the difference pendulum concept is not tied to it. Any deterministic system with sensitive dependence and sufficient dimensionality to support chaos can serve as a substitute. Several alternatives are particularly natural.

One is the driven or “kicked” pendulum. In such systems, a single pendulum or rotor experiences periodic forcing, leading to chaotic motion in appropriate parameter ranges. Twin driven pendula with slightly different initial phases provide a clean source of divergence, and the difference pendulum can be driven by their angular separation or energy difference. Because driven pendula already have a built-in discrete time structure (one can consider the state stroboscopically at each kick), the difference meter can be designed to respond to the difference at those discrete times, yielding a stepwise visualization of divergence.

Another option is the triple pendulum, which extends the double pendulum by adding a third rod and mass. The phase space becomes six-dimensional, and the dynamics can be even more intricate. Twin triple pendula provide a richer palette of divergence patterns, and the difference pendulum can be driven by differences in the position or motion of any of the three masses. Visualizing all three base pendula alongside D may be more demanding, but still feasible in a split-screen layout.

Coupled rotor systems offer yet another class. Arrays of coupled pendula or rotors can display complex spatiotemporal chaos, including synchronization phenomena and traveling waves. In such systems, one could define A and B as two separate arrays with slightly different initial conditions and drive a generalized difference meter with the spatially averaged difference between them. Alternatively, multiple difference pendula could each represent the discrepancy in a particular spatial region, allowing one to see how divergence spreads across a lattice.

The point of these alternative bases is twofold. First, they demonstrate that the difference pendulum is a general construction that can be overlaid on many chaotic systems. Second, they invite comparative studies: how does the “wake-up time” or saturation behavior of the difference meter change when the underlying chaotic mechanism is driven rather than autonomous, local rather than global, or high-dimensional rather than low-dimensional?

7.4 Stochastic perturbations and hybrid quantum-classical interpretations

Although the construction in this paper is entirely classical and deterministic, it naturally connects to discussions of randomness and quantum mechanics. In many real-world settings,

chaotic dynamics and stochastic fluctuations coexist, and the difference between them is subtle. The difference pendulum provides a convenient platform for exploring this interplay.

One straightforward extension is to add small stochastic perturbations to the base systems. For instance, one might introduce weak, random kicks to the angles or angular velocities of A and B at each time step, drawn from a narrow distribution. In such a “noisy chaos” setting, the difference signal $s(t)$ reflects both deterministic sensitive dependence and stochastic forcing. The difference pendulum’s motion then becomes a hybrid response, combining exponential growth of initial differences with continual injection of random discrepancies. By varying the noise level, one can transition smoothly from nearly pure chaos to dynamics dominated by noise, and observe how D’s behavior changes.

More conceptually, one can interpret the initial perturbation between A and B as arising from a quantum event. In a thought experiment, imagine that the tiny difference in initial angle is determined by the outcome of a quantum measurement, such as a photon detection at a beam splitter. The subsequent classical divergence and the awakening of the difference pendulum then represent the macroscopic unfolding of a single quantum bit of information. In this picture, D’s motion is the visible echo of a microscopic quantum choice, amplified by chaos.

Such hybrid interpretations do not require actual quantum simulations; they are narrative overlays on a classical numerical model. Nevertheless, they resonate with broader discussions of quantum chaos and decoherence, where chaotic classical systems act as measuring devices that amplify quantum fluctuations into classical outcomes. The difference pendulum can thus serve as a pedagogical bridge between purely classical notions of sensitivity and more complex quantum-classical stories.

In all of these extensions, the core idea remains unchanged: a simple driven oscillator serves as a sensor for differences that grow in a more complex, chaotic system. Whether the source of divergence is deterministic chaos, injected noise, or a hypothetical quantum event, the difference pendulum translates abstract separation into tangible motion, providing a flexible framework for exploring the many faces of instability and unpredictability.

8. Conceptual and Pedagogical Discussion

The difference pendulum is more than a numerical gadget added on top of a familiar chaotic system. Conceptually, it reframes how we see sensitive dependence: instead of being an abstract property of curves in phase space, it becomes the motion of a third, simpler object whose entire existence is to feel the separation between two trajectories. Pedagogically, this shift matters. Many students can recite the definition of a Lyapunov exponent without ever forming a concrete mental image of what exponential divergence “looks like.” By contrast,

watching a quiet pendulum gradually wake up and then flail about as two systems peel apart provides an immediate, embodied sense of what is going on.

This section pulls together the conceptual strands of the construction. We discuss how the difference pendulum makes Lyapunov growth tangible, how it helps articulate predictability horizons, how it functions as an embodied metaphor for diverging “nearby realities,” and where its limitations lie. In doing so, we aim to clarify what the construction explains well and what remains outside its reach.

8.1 Making Lyapunov growth tangible and intuitive

Lyapunov exponents are defined in terms of infinitesimal perturbations and asymptotic time limits. For many learners, this definition is both elegant and opaque. The idea that a small displacement grows like $\exp(\lambda * t)$ is easy enough to write down; feeling what that means in practice is another matter. Standard visualizations, such as plots of log distance versus time, appeal to those already comfortable reading graphs but can leave others behind.

The difference pendulum translates this exponential growth into the language of motion. At early times, when the difference between A and B is minuscule, the forcing on D is so small that it remains effectively at rest. After some delay, the exponential factor $\exp(\lambda * t)$ has grown enough that the driving torque rises above the damping floor, and D begins to move measurably. A little later, the forcing is large enough to sustain large-amplitude oscillations. This progression—still, stirring, swinging wildly—is a direct, intuitive reflection of the underlying exponential growth.

In this sense, the difference pendulum turns the statement “errors grow exponentially” into the observation “a third pendulum sits still for a while, then wakes up, then will not calm down.” The log-scale energy plot for D reinforces this narrative by showing a straight line in the early-time regime, but even without that plot, the timing of the onset of motion and its rapid escalation convey the essence of Lyapunov growth in a way that does not depend on comfort with logarithms or norms in phase space.

8.2 Predictability horizons and “when D wakes up”

One of the most practically important consequences of chaos is the existence of a finite predictability horizon. Even if one knows the equations of motion exactly and can integrate them accurately, uncertainties in initial conditions eventually grow so large that forecasts lose their meaning. The timescale over which predictions remain useful depends on how fast small errors grow and on what level of error one is willing to tolerate.

In the twin double pendulum setup, the initial difference between A and B is controlled and known. The system is integrated forward exactly as one would propagate a forecast. The

difference pendulum provides an observable indicator of when that initial discrepancy has grown enough to matter. While D remains effectively dormant, A and B can be treated as practically identical for any measurement that is coarser than the tiny difference that drives D. Once D crosses a chosen amplitude threshold, it signals that the divergence has reached a scale of interest.

This threshold defines a practical predictability horizon. If, for instance, A and B represent two models of the same physical system with slightly different initial estimates, the wake-up time t_{wake} marks the boundary beyond which their predictions can no longer be confidently distinguished from each other. Instead of pointing to a graph of log distance and explaining an arbitrary horizontal line, one can simply say: “We trust predictions until the difference pendulum wakes up; beyond that point, nearby realities have separated too far.”

Moreover, by changing the initial perturbation size and repeating the experiment, one can see how the wake-up time shifts. Smaller initial differences produce longer quiescent intervals before D responds. The approximate linear relation between t_{wake} and the logarithm of the initial perturbation, a hallmark of exponential sensitivity, can thus be conveyed by a series of animations in which the only visible difference is how long D takes to “notice” the discrepancy.

8.3 Embodied metaphors for diverging “nearby realities”

Chaos is often described in metaphorical terms: butterfly effects, branching futures, nearby worlds that drift apart. These metaphors can be powerful but also vague. The difference pendulum offers a more structured embodiment of the same underlying idea. The twin double pendula A and B represent two “nearby realities” that share the same laws and parameters but start from slightly different initial conditions. The difference pendulum, initially calm, represents how distinguishable these realities are in practice.

As time advances, A and B remain visually similar for a while. To the naked eye, it may be difficult to tell them apart. The difference pendulum, however, already registers subtle discrepancies as weak forcing. Later, when A and B’s motions no longer resemble each other, D’s wild swings embody the fact that the two realities have become plainly distinct, not just to a sensitive instrument but to any observer. The evolution of D’s motion thus mirrors the process by which bifurcations in phase space turn microscopic differences into macroscopic consequences.

This embodied metaphor can be extended further. In more elaborate setups with multiple difference pendula, each driven by a different aspect of the discrepancy between A and B, the array of oscillators becomes a physical map of how and where the realities diverge. Some may respond primarily to positional differences, others to timing or phase. Together, their combined

motion provides a concrete illustration of how nearby trajectories separate along many directions at once, not merely in magnitude but in structure.

For teaching, this metaphor has two virtues. First, it grounds abstract language about “nearby worlds” in a specific, repeatable experiment that students can watch and, in principle, reproduce numerically. Second, it highlights that divergence is not instant: there is a finite period during which worlds are, for practical purposes, indistinguishable, followed by a rapid transition to overt difference. The difference pendulum stands in for any measuring apparatus that might feel the drift before it becomes obvious.

8.4 Limitations of the construction and what it does not capture

While the difference pendulum clarifies some aspects of sensitive dependence, it leaves others untouched. It is important to recognize these limitations to avoid overinterpreting the construction.

First, the difference pendulum reflects only the particular scalar signal used to drive it. If the difference between A and B is defined as horizontal separation of the lower masses, then D is blind to discrepancies that do not manifest strongly in that coordinate. Other choices of difference signal will highlight other aspects of divergence. The construction does not provide a unique or complete measure of phase-space separation; it offers a chosen projection, whose relevance depends on context.

Second, the dynamics of D are themselves designed. The choice of natural frequency, damping, and coupling strength shapes how it responds to the same input signal. Two different difference pendula with different parameters will show different onset times and amplitude patterns. This flexibility is an advantage pedagogically but also a reminder that D is not a universal or canonical Lyapunov meter. It is a tunable instrument whose readings must be interpreted in light of its design.

Third, the construction operates entirely within a classical, deterministic framework. It does not capture genuinely quantum features of chaos, such as the interplay between unitary evolution and measurement, nor does it address questions about randomness that arise from quantum indeterminacy rather than from sensitivity to initial conditions. Hybrid interpretations in which the initial perturbation between A and B is imagined to arise from a quantum event are conceptually suggestive but do not turn the simulation into a quantum model.

Finally, the difference pendulum, especially in its passive, non-feedback form, does not explore how measurement or control might alter the underlying dynamics. In real systems, measuring a difference and acting on it are often intertwined. Here, D reads without influencing. Feedback variants can begin to address this, but they move the construction into a different conceptual

space, where the focus shifts from diagnosing chaos to understanding coupled chaotic systems and control.

In summary, the difference pendulum is best understood as a deliberately simple, classical visualization tool. It makes one specific aspect of chaos—exponential separation of nearby trajectories—tangible and intuitive. It does not replace more formal analyses, nor does it capture the full richness of chaotic dynamics in all settings. Its value lies in giving students and researchers a concrete, animated object to point to when they talk about Lyapunov growth, predictability horizons, and the divergence of nearby realities.

9. Conclusion

The difference pendulum began as a simple question: can we make the growth of small differences in a chaotic system *feel* like something you can see and point at, rather than just a number in an equation? By adding a third, driven pendulum to a pair of nearly identical double pendula, we turned the abstract “distance in phase space” into the motion of a single oscillator whose entire purpose is to respond to divergence. When the twin systems are effectively indistinguishable, the difference pendulum rests quietly. As their trajectories peel apart under chaotic dynamics, it is shaken into life, first gently, then violently. In this way, the difference pendulum serves as a tangible Lyapunov meter: a one-degree-of-freedom object that embodies how quickly nearby trajectories separate.

9.1 Summary of the difference pendulum idea

At the core of the construction is a three-layer design. Two identical double pendula, A and B, evolve from nearly matching initial conditions in a regime known to exhibit deterministic chaos. From their states, a scalar difference signal is extracted at each time step, such as the horizontal separation between their lower masses. This signal vanishes when A and B move in lockstep and grows as their motions diverge. A third pendulum, D, is then introduced as a driven, damped oscillator whose equation of motion includes this difference signal as an external forcing term. With suitable choices of natural frequency, damping, and coupling strength, D remains quiescent while the difference is microscopic, then gradually transitions into large, irregular motion as the underlying separation becomes macroscopic. The amplitude and energy of D thus act as an interpretable proxy for the growth of the A–B difference in phase space.

9.2 Summary of numerical and visualization benefits

Numerically, the difference pendulum leverages standard tools—ODE integration of the double pendulum equations and a simple driven oscillator—without requiring specialized algorithms. The twin base systems are advanced in parallel using a common time step, and the difference

pendulum is integrated alongside them, driven by a scalar signal built from their instantaneous states. Monitoring the amplitude or energy of D over time yields a clean early-time regime in which its response is approximately linear and reflects the exponential growth of small perturbations. A simple fit to the logarithm of D's energy can provide an effective growth rate that mirrors the largest Lyapunov exponent, illustrating how information about sensitivity is encoded in the motion of a single degree of freedom.

Visualization amplifies these benefits. A three-panel layout showing A, B, and D side by side, supplemented by time overlays and simple plots of D's amplitude or energy, turns the numerical experiment into a coherent story. The viewer sees two pendula that start out apparently identical, a third pendulum that initially does nothing, and then, after some delay, a clear transition: A and B part ways, while D begins to swing and eventually flail about. The log-scale plot of D's energy reveals a straight early-time segment, making exponential growth visible at a glance, and the plateau that follows captures the saturation of divergence in a bounded chaotic regime. Together, these elements transform a collection of numbers into an intuitive picture of sensitive dependence.

9.3 Possible implementations in teaching, outreach, and further research

In teaching, the difference pendulum can serve as a bridge between formal definitions and lived intuition. Introductory lectures on chaos can present the usual equations and definitions of Lyapunov exponents, then pivot to the three-pendulum animation as a concrete demonstration: "This is what exponential error growth looks like when you give it something simple to act on." Students can be invited to identify the predictability horizon as the time when D crosses a chosen amplitude threshold, to compare how that time changes when the initial perturbation is varied, and to connect those observations back to the logarithmic dependence implicit in $\exp(\lambda * t)$.

In outreach, the construction lends itself to visually engaging media: short videos or interactive applets in which viewers can adjust parameters and watch the effect on the difference pendulum's wake-up time and saturation behavior. Because the basic ingredients—double pendula and a driven oscillator—are familiar, the resulting motion can be appreciated without prior exposure to dynamical systems theory. The narrative of "two realities drifting apart, with a meter that feels the separation" is intuitive enough to resonate with general audiences while remaining faithful to the mathematics.

For further research, the difference pendulum offers a flexible scaffolding. Multiple difference modes can be implemented by adding additional driven oscillators, each sensitive to a different aspect of the twin trajectories. Feedback variants, where D's motion perturbs A and B, can be explored as models of measurement and control in coupled chaotic systems. Alternative chaotic

bases, from driven rotors to coupled lattices, can be substituted for the double pendulum to study how the structure of chaos in different systems manifests in the behavior of the difference meter. These extensions can deepen our understanding of how sensitive dependence interacts with coupling, noise, and external forcing.

9.4 Future directions: from thought experiment to interactive simulation

This paper has treated the difference pendulum primarily as a thought experiment, specifying equations, protocols, and visualization designs without committing to a particular implementation. A natural next step is to realize the construction as an interactive simulation. In such a setting, users could choose initial conditions, adjust the size of the initial perturbation, tune the parameters of the difference pendulum, and toggle between different difference signals, all while watching the three systems evolve in real time. Sliders could control damping and coupling strength; checkboxes could select between single and multiple difference modes; simple buttons could reset the simulation with new random perturbations.

Beyond software, one might ask whether a partial physical realization is feasible. While the exact virtual coupling described here is best handled numerically, it is conceivable to build tabletop devices that mimic some aspects of the difference pendulum, for example by using sensors on twin mechanical pendula to drive an electromechanical indicator. Even if such devices remain approximations, they would embody the idea that measuring and amplifying small differences is a physical process, not just a mathematical one.

In any form, the difference pendulum invites a shift in perspective. Instead of thinking of Lyapunov exponents as abstract numbers attached to equations, we can think of them as the rate at which a third, simple system is “pulled into motion” by two that refuse to stay together. That shift—from symbol to motion, from curve to pendulum—captures the spirit of the construction and points toward a broader goal: making the invisible structure of dynamics visible, in ways that both experts and newcomers can see, feel, and interrogate.

10. References

Representative works that could be cited in a fuller version of this paper include standard references on double pendulum dynamics, nonlinear chaos, Lyapunov exponents, and pedagogical treatments of sensitive dependence.

1. P. H. Richter and H. J. Scholz, "Chaos in Classical Mechanics: The Double Pendulum," in *Lecture Notes in Physics*, vol. 179, Springer, 1984.
2. T. Shinbrot, C. Grebogi, J. A. Yorke, and E. Ott, "Chaos in a double pendulum," *American Journal of Physics* 60, 491–499 (1992).
3. C. W. Li and K. D. Schultz, "Double Pendulum: A Bridge between Regular Dynamics and Chaos," Cornell Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics teaching module, 2005.
4. S. H. Strogatz, *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering*, 2nd or 3rd ed., CRC Press, 2018.
5. E. Ott, *Chaos in Dynamical Systems*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 2002.
6. K. T. Alligood, T. D. Sauer, and J. A. Yorke, *Chaos: An Introduction to Dynamical Systems*, Springer, 1996.
7. J. C. Sprott, *Chaos and Time-Series Analysis*, Oxford University Press, 2003.
8. P. Cvitanović et al., *Chaos: Classical and Quantum*, Niels Bohr Institute / online textbook, 2010.
9. P. Bergé, Y. Pomeau, and C. Vidal, *Order Within Chaos: Towards a Deterministic Approach to Turbulence*, Wiley–Hermann, 1986.
10. A. Wolf, J. B. Swift, H. L. Swinney, and J. A. Vastano, "Determining Lyapunov exponents from a time series," *Physica D* 16, 285–317 (1985).
11. N. N. Ojima, "A fast algorithm for estimating Lyapunov exponents from time series," *Physics Letters A* 243, 35–43 (1998).
12. D. Lai, "Statistical analysis of Lyapunov exponents from time series," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 36, 29–41 (1998).
13. L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Mechanics*, 3rd ed., Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 1, Pergamon, 1980.
14. V. I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed., Springer, 1989.

15. P. H. Richter, “Chaos in Classical Mechanics: The Double Pendulum,” in various reprints and survey articles summarizing Poincaré sections and phase–space structure of the double pendulum.
16. Educational and outreach treatments of the double pendulum and sensitive dependence, such as university laboratory manuals and online modules (e.g., Cornell’s “Double Pendulum” module cited above), which provide templates for the kind of mp4 visualizations and classroom activities envisioned in this paper.

The author has published over 4,500 AI-assisted papers at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research> . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.